

BI
CMT
a polyester film positioned against a surface of said ethylene vinyl acetate film opposite said low-density polyethylene film, said polyester film being bonded to said innermost layer by a water-miscible acryl-based adhesive.

REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendments, original Claim 1 has been canceled and new Claim 2 substituted therefor. Reconsideration of the rejections, in light of the foregoing amendments and present remarks, is respectfully requested. The present amendments have been entered for the purpose of placing the claim language into a more proper U.S. format and for the purpose of more clearly distinguishing the present invention from the prior art.

In the Official Action, it was indicated that Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Toney patent in view of the McNaul patent and further in view of the Sugahara patent. Claim 1 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite.

Applicant has amended the language of original Claim 1 in the form of new Claim 2. The new Claim 2 recites each of the elements of the original Claim 1 but expresses them in a proper U.S. format, including proper antecedent bases and proper structural interrelationships throughout. Any indefinite terminology found in original Claim 1 has been removed in new Claim 2. In particular, Claim 2 recites with specificity, the exact layering of the "layered film article" of the present invention. The term "subject sheet" has been positively recited.

As an overview to the present reply, Applicant notes that the present invention achieves significant advantages over the existing prior art. These advantages are achieved by virtue of the particular structure employed by the present invention. The use of the PVC film as the surface

layer provides an extremely high embossing effect and an elegant texture. This advantage is recited on page 9, lines 3 - 7 as follows:

The recruitment of the soft PVC film as a surface layer enjoys advantages of obtaining an extremely high embossing effect and of providing archaic and elegant texture to the sight by virtue of its lower gloss than have other resin films.

In particular, in Claim 2, it is recited that the outermost layer is the "embossed" polyvinyl chloride film sheet. Additionally, the structure of the present invention facilitates the ability to emboss patterns on the outermost layer, as was recited on page 9, lines 8 - 14 as follows:

Virtual impossibility is imposed on the embossing of polyester films. It is possible to emboss LDPE films, while the LDPE films pass through the rollers at such a high temperature, the embossed patterns on LDPE films are melted to take fade-outs. When this phenomenon is taken into account, the outermost layer is most preferably prepared from PVC.

Additionally, the particular acryl-based adhesive strongly allows the sandwiched and layered film article of the present invention to withstand the shear forces from the rollers through which the article passes. This advantage was stated on page 9, lines 18 - 23 as follows:

In addition, the adhesive layer between the outermost PVC film and the LDPE film functions to reinforce the PVC film which sustains most seriously the shear force from the engaged rollers while the adhesive layer between the innermost EVA film and the polyester film maintains the EVA layer in its integrity.

Additionally, the use of the intermediate polyester film layer allows the layered film article of the present invention to be dimensionally stable by virtue of its excellent thermal resistance. As was

recited on pages 9 and 10, lines 24 - 6 of the original specification:

In the meanwhile, the intermediate LDPE film and the EVA layers are so flexible that they can be buffed to prevent the deformation or twisting of the sheet, which is apt to occur because of the difference of the coefficient of thermal expansion between the different material layers, the innermost layer and the outermost layer. The intermediate polyester film guarantees the sheet to be dimensionally stable by virtue of its excellent thermal resistance.

Additionally and furthermore, the particular layered arrangement of the present invention allows the application of low temperatures to the laminating process. As a result, the deterioration of the subject sheet is prevented. As was stated on pages 10 and 11 of the original specification:

In the layered film sheet for coating, in accordance with the present invention, as described hereinbefore, the innermost layer, which is brought into contact with a subject, is softened and of adhesion at low temperatures and thus, a decrease can be brought about in the total coating temperature, enabling the outermost PVC film to be expressed in effective embossed patterns. In addition, such low temperature coating prevents the subjects, such as pictures, prints, paleography, etc., from being deteriorated by heat. For instance, the low temperature of the coating can afford a clear product which is free of speckles which result from the spreading or running of gelatin on a photograph or ink on a print when it is melted at high temperatures. Further, a subject, when coated with a layered film sheet of the present invention, can be semi-permanently preserved due to the excellent film tightness of the layered film sheet.

As can be seen, the present invention, with its particular layered arrangement, offers significant advantages over the prior art. Applicant respectfully contends that the prior art combination cited by the Examiner does not show this structure, does not carry out the function of the present invention, nor does the prior art combination achieve the advantages of the present invention.

The prior art Toney describes an "antifog" film laminant. In particular, this laminant includes a first layer of a blend of polyolefin and an antifogging agent, a bonding layer of polyolefin, a second substrate bonded to a bonding layer of the first substrate and including polyester or nylon, and an adhesive between the first and second substrates. The bonding layer is pre-treated by corona discharge before windup.

The prior art Sugahara patent describes a thermosetting resin-impregnated prepreg layer, a rubber or thermoplastic resin layer and a hot melt resin adhesive layer.

The McNaul patent describes a sheet having a polyvinyl chloride film, an application tape adhered to one surface of the film and a carrier tape adhered to the application tape.

As can be seen, none of these prior art patents describes the structure of the present invention, namely, the sandwiched arrangement, from top to bottom as follows: (1) embossed PVC film; (2) LDPE film; (3) EVA film; (4) polyester film; (5) the EVA sheet; (6) the subject sheet; (7) the EVA sheet; (8) the polyester film; (9) the EVA film; (10) the LDPE film; and (11) the embossed PVC. In fact, there is nothing in the prior art, individually or in combination, which would suggest such a sandwiched arrangement.

The purposes of the present invention are neither shown nor suggested by the prior art combination. Fundamentally, the Toney patent is for an antifog film laminant. The Sugahara patent is a laminant with improved dimensional stability and heat resistance by using a thermohardening resin. The McNaul patent describes a surface printable PVC laminant with a carrier so as to form a cold transfer film. None of these prior art patents suggest the use of an embossed PVC layer. Also, none of the prior art patents suggest the sandwich relationship of various film laminants for the purposes of achieving the advantages of the present invention.

On this basis, Applicant respectfully contends that the structure of the present invention, as now claimed, is neither shown nor suggested by the prior art combination.

Based upon the foregoing analysis, Applicant contends that independent Claim 2 is now in proper condition for allowance. Additionally, those claims which are dependent upon Claim 2 should also be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the present claims at an early date is earnestly solicited. Since no new claims have been added above those originally paid for, no additional fee is required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 10-30-01

John S. Egbert
Reg. No. 30,627
Attorney for Applicant

Harrison & Egbert
412 Main Street, 7th Floor
Houston, Texas 77002
(713)224-8080
(713)223-4873 (Fax)